



lubricants, graphite, alloying elements, binders and plasticizers; pressing the metal powder to form a compacts; and sintering the compact to form a sintered metal compact. The Examiner states that Storstrom does not teach any specific compacting pressures or sintering techniques. The Examiner states that Dunn teaches the use of inductive sintering of metal powder compacts to produce sintered bodies of high uniformity. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to use inductive sintering as taught by Dunn in the Strostrom invention to produce sintered metal compacts of high uniformity. The Examiner further concludes that one of ordinary skill would select compacting pressure "by routine experimentation based on the selection of specific starting materials to produce a sintered body of high density, the selection thus being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the cited prior art. See, e.g., MPEP §2143.03. Also, while a *prima facie* finding of obviousness necessarily includes the combining of prior art teachings, various prior art teachings are not properly combined unless there is something in the prior art itself that suggests that those teachings could or should be combined. MPEP §2143.01. Put another way, the mere fact that prior art teachings can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination or modification. MPEP §2143.01. In addition, it must be remembered that a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, *i.e.*, as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. MPEP §2141.02.